

was proficient in the use of a blow torch, accidentally set his hair on fire.

But Clevelanders love to tell the story about when Mayor Perk, a Republican, was invited to a State dinner by then President Richard Nixon, and it conflicted with his wife Lucy's bowling night, so he was not able to be in attendance on that particular evening.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Perk was vintage Cleveland, and he will be greatly missed. He is best known as Cleveland's mayor, but he had a distinguished career as a public servant. He began his political career in 1940 as a Republican precinct committeeman, and was appointed to the staff of the Ohio Attorney General's Office in 1950. He then went on to represent the Broadway East 55th Street area of Cleveland as a councilman from 1953 to 1962.

He was then elected to county-wide office, and served as the county auditor for 9 years. When he was elected mayor, Mayor Perk had the distinction of being the first Republican mayor of Cleveland since the 1930s. In fact, only two Republicans have served as the mayor of Cleveland in my lifetime, Ralph Perk and also our new Senator from Ohio, GEORGE VOINOVICH.

God love Ralph Perk, Mr. Speaker. He was a Republican in the days when being a Republican was not very cool. His political base was found in Cleveland's heavily Democratic ethnic communities, which supported him regardless of party label. He won folks over with his heart and his ability to be just like everyone else, to connect with his fellow man without pretense.

If another mayor had turned down a State dinner at the White House because of his wife's bowling engagement, it would have been a serious breach of etiquette. To Ralph Perk and the city of Cleveland, it is a badge of honor.

Mayor Perk served as mayor from 1972 to 1977, at a time when the city was developing some financial difficulties, but Ralph Perk was able to work with the Federal Government and the Nixon White House to secure funding to alleviate a number of those difficulties.

He is credited with establishing a regional sewer district, and he is also credited with paying off the bonds, using city funds to pay off the bonds of the financially strapped Cleveland Transit Authority to create what is now the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority.

Mr. Speaker, although it has been more than 20 years since Ralph Perk served as the mayor of our fair city, he has never been nor will he ever be forgotten. He was a true Cleveland original, a man who loved his hometown with all of his heart and served it with great spirit and dedication. He will be sorely missed.

Mayor Perk was reelected as mayor in both 1973 and 1975. In 1977, there was a nonpartisan primary and he was defeated by two other individuals. One was a Member who served in this House, Ed Feighan, and the other is my

very distinguished greater Clevelander, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DENNIS KUCINICH), who then went on to serve as mayor of Cleveland, and now serves with us in the House.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for his thoughts and remembrances of Mayor Perk.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) also for the opportunity to share in this very important reflection on a former mayor of the city of Cleveland, Mayor Ralph J. Perk.

Ralph Perk leaves us at a time when the world could use the message of his life, which was to unite people across racial and ethnic lines. For generations he led us in celebrating the beautiful cultural mosaic that is our inheritance in greater Cleveland. He understood the beauty and the strength of each individual expressing his or her own uniqueness.

I shared with Ralph many a platform, festooned with colorful flags, many an ethnic picnic, many polka-filled moments. He had a great enthusiasm for life. He was a wise and dedicated public servant who served Cleveland long and well as a city councilman, a county auditor, and mayor. His greatest strength was his common touch, his ability to stay close to the life of Cleveland's neighborhoods.

Throughout his long life he never left the city he loved, and because of his dedication to Cleveland, his memory will never leave us. My deepest sympathies go out to his dear wife, Lucy, and to his children.

I will miss Ralph, but I shall never be able to think of him without smiling about this engaging, energetic, passionate public man and dear friend.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND NATO'S INVOLVEMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA AND KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, supporters of internationalism celebrated NATO's 50th anniversary with the Senate's 1998 overwhelming approval for expanding NATO to include Eastern European countries. This year's official inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic made all NATO's supporters proud, indeed. But in reality, NATO now is weaker and more chaotic than ever.

In the effort to expand NATO and promote internationalism, we see in reaction the rise of ugly nationalism. The U.S. and NATO policy of threats and intimidation to establish an autonomous Kosovo without true independence from Serbia, and protected by NATO's forces for the foreseeable future, has been a recipe for disaster.

This policy of nation-building and interference in a civil war totally contradicts the mission of European defense set out in the NATO charter.

Without the Soviet enemy to justify the European military machine, NATO had to find enemies and humanitarian missions to justify its existence. The centuries-old ethnic hatreds found in Yugoslavia and the militant leaders on all sides have served this purpose well. Working hard to justify NATO's policy in this region has totally obscured any objective analysis of the turmoil now raging.

Some specific policy positions of NATO guaranteed that the ongoing strife would erupt into a full-fledged and dangerous conflict. Once it was determined in the early 1990s that outsiders would indict and try Yugoslavian war criminals, it was certain that cooperation with western negotiators would involve risks. Fighting to the end became a practical alternative to a mock international trial. Forcing a treaty settlement on Serbia where Serbia would lose the sovereign territory of Kosovo guaranteed an escalation of the fighting and the forced removal of the Kosovars from their homes.

□ 1730

Ignoring the fact that more than 500,000 Serbs were uprooted from Croatia and Bosnia with the encouragement of NATO intervention did great harm to the regional effort to reestablish more stable borders.

The sympathy shown Albanian refugees by our government and our media, although justified, stirred the flames of hatred by refusing to admit that over a half million Serbs suffered the same fate and yet elicited no concern from the internationalists bent on waging war. No one is calling for the return of certain property and homes.

Threatening a country to do what we the outsiders tell them or their cities will be bombed is hardly considered good diplomacy. Arguing that the Serbs must obey and give up what they see as sovereign territory after suffering much themselves as well as face war crimes trials run by the West makes no sense. Anyone should have been able to predict what the results would be.

The argument that, because of humanitarian concerns for the refugees, we were forced to act is not plausible. Our efforts dramatically increased the refugee problem. Milosevic, as he felt cornered by the Western threats, reacted the only way he could to protect what he considered Serbia, a position he defends with international law while being supported by unified Serb people.

If it is the suffering and the refugees that truly motivate our actions, there is no answer to the perplexing question of why no action was taken to help the suffering in Rwanda, Sudan, East Timore, Tibet, Chechnya, Kurdish, Turkey, and for the Palestinians in Israel. This is not a reason; it is an excuse.

Instead, we give massive foreign aid to the likes of China and Russia, countries that have trampled on the rights of ethnic minorities.

How many refugees, how many children's death has U.S. policy caused by our embargo and bombing for 9 years of a defenseless poverty-ridden Iraq. Just as our bombs in Iraq have caused untold misery and death, so have our bombs in Serbia killed the innocent on both sides, solidified support for the ruthless leaders, and spread the war.

This policy of intervention is paid for by the U.S. taxpayer and promoted illegally by our President without congressional authority, as is required by the Constitution.

The United States Government has in the past referred to the Kosovo Liberation Army leaders as thugs, terrorists, Marxists, and drug dealers. This current fight was initiated by Kosovo's desire for independence from Serbia.

The KLA took on the Serbs, not the other way around. Whether or not one is sympathetic to Kosovo's secession is not relevant. I for one prefer many small independent governments pledged not to aggress against their neighbors over the international special interest authoritarianism of NATO, the CIA, and the United Nations.

But my sympathies do not justify our taxing and sending young Americans to fight for Kosovo's independence. It is wrong legally and morally; and besides, the KLA is not likely to institute a model nation respecting civil liberties of all its citizens.

The biggest irony of this entire mess is to see the interventionists, whose goal is one world government, so determined to defend a questionable group of local leaders, the KLA, bent on secession. This action will not go unnoticed and will provide the philosophic framework for the establishment of a Palestinian state, Kurdistan, and independent Tibet, and it will encourage many other ethnic minorities to demand independence.

Our policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, and their border disputes is not one that comes from American tradition or constitutional law. It is a policy based on our current leaders' belief that we are the policemen of the world, something we have earnestly and foolishly pursued since World War II and in a more aggressive fashion since the demise of the Soviet Union.

Interventionism is done with a pretense of wisdom believing we always know the good guys from the bad guys and that we will ignore the corporate and political special interests always agitating for influence. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Instead of being lucky enough on occasions to pick the right side of a conflict, we instead end up supporting both sides of nearly every conflict. In the 1980s, we helped arm, and allied ourselves with, the Iraqis against Iran. Also in the 1980s we supported the Af-

ghan freedom fighters, which included Osama Bin Laden. Even in the current crisis in Yugoslavia, we have found ourselves on both sides.

The United States, along with the United Nations, in 1992 supported an arms embargo against Kosovo essentially making it impossible for the Kosovars to defend themselves against Serbia. Helping the Albanian Muslims is interpreted by some as token appeasement to the Arab oil countries unhappy with the advantage the Serbs got from the arms embargo.

This balancing act between three vicious warring factions was doomed to fail and has only led to more instability and the spreading of the war in the region.

Instead of pretending to be everything to everyone, while shifting alliances and blindly hoping for good to come of it, we should reconsider the advice of the Founders and take seriously the strict restraints on waging war placed in the Constitution.

Not much long-term good can come of a foreign policy designed to meddle and manipulate in places where we have no business or authority. It cannot help the cause of peace.

Unfortunately, our policies usually backfire and do more harm than good. When weaker nations are intimidated by more powerful ones, striking back very often can be done only through terrorism, a problem that will continue to threaten all Americans as our leaders incite those who oppose our aggressive stands throughout the world.

War has been used throughout history to enhance the state against the people. Taxes, conscription and inflation have been used as tools of the state to pursue wars not popular with the people. Government size and authority always grows with war, as the people are told that only the sacrifice of their liberties can save the nation. Propaganda and threats are used to coerce the people into this careless giving up of their liberties.

This has always been true with military wars, but the same can be said of the war mentality associated with the war on drugs, the war on poverty, the war against illiteracy, or any other war proposed by some social do-gooder or intentional mischief maker.

But when a foreign war comes to our shores in the form of terrorism, we can be sure that our government will explain the need for further sacrifice of personal liberties to win this war against terrorism as well. Extensive preparations are already being made to fight urban and domestic violence, not by an enhanced local police force, but by a national police force with military characteristics.

Even the war against national disasters led by FEMA, usurps local authority while imposing restraints on movement and controlling recovery efforts that should be left to local police, private insurance, and voluntary groups.

Our overseas efforts to police the world implies that with or without suc-

cess, resulting injuries and damage imposed by us and others will be rectified with U.S. tax dollars in the form of more foreign aid, as we always do. Nation building and international social work has replaced national defense as the proper responsibility of our government.

What will the fate of NATO be in the coming years? Many are fretting that NATO may dissolve over a poor showing in Yugoslavia, despite the 50th anniversary hype and its recent expansion. Fortunately for those who cherish liberty and limited government, NATO has a questionable future.

When our leaders sanctioned NATO in 1949, there were many patriotic Americans who questioned the wisdom and the constitutionality of this organization. It was by its charter to be strictly a defensive organization designed to defend Western Europe from any Soviet threat. The NATO charter clearly recognized the Security Council of the United Nations was responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Likewise, the legislative history and congressional testimony maintained NATO could not usurp from Congress and the people the power to wage war. We have drifted a long way from that acknowledgment, and the fears expressed by Robert Taft and others in 1949 were certainly justified.

United States and NATO, while deliberately avoiding a U.N. vote on the issue, have initiated war against a sovereign state in the middle of a civil war. A Civil War that caused thousands of casualties and refugees on both sides has been turned into a war with hundreds of thousands of casualties and refugees with NATO's interference. The not-so-idle U.S. threats cast at Milosevic did not produce compliance. It only expanded the violence and the bloodshed.

The foolishness of this policy has become apparent, but Western leaders are quick to justify their warmongering. It was not peace or liberty or national security they sought as they sent the bombs flying. It was to save face for NATO.

Without the Soviets to worry about, NATO needed a mission, and stopping the evil Serbs fit the bill. It was convenient to ignore the evil Croates and the Kosovars, and it certainly was easy to forget the United Nations', NATO's, and the United States' policies over the past decade that contributed to the mess in Yugoslavia.

It was soon apparent that bombing was no more a successful diplomatic tool than were the threats of dire consequences if the treaty, unfavorable to the Serbs, was not quickly signed by Milosevic. This drew demands that policy must be directed toward saving NATO by expanding the war. NATO's credibility was now at stake and how could Europe, and the United States war machine, survive if NATO were to disintegrate.

Hopes as expressed by Ron Brown and his corporate friends were not extinguished by the unfortunate and mysterious Air Force crash while on their way to Bosnia to do business deals. Nobody even bothers to find out what U.S. policy condones business trips of our corporate leaders in a war zone on an Air Force aircraft. Corporate interests and the military-industrial complex continues to play a role in our Yugoslavian war policy. Corporate America loves NATO.

Most politicians and the public do not know what NATO's real mission is, and today's policy cannot be explained by reading its mission statement written in 1949. Certainly our vital interests and national security cannot justify our escalation of the war in Yugoslavia.

The excuse that we are the only superpower is hardly a moral reason to justify bombing nations that are seen as uncooperative. Military strength gives neither a right to bully nor a monopoly on wisdom. This strength too often, when held by large political entities, is used criminally to serve the powerful special interests.

The Persian Gulf and Yugoslavia obviously are much more economically intriguing than Rwanda and Sudan. There are clearly no business benefits for taking on the Chinese over its policy toward Tibet. Quite the contrary, we do business with China and subsidize her to boot.

In spite of the powerful political and industrial leaders' support behind NATO, and the budgets of 19 Western countries, NATO's days appear numbered. We shall not weep when NATO goes the way of the Soviet Empire and the Warsaw Pact. Managing a war with 19 vetoes makes it impossible for a coherent strategy to evolve. Chaos, bickering, bureaucratic blundering, waste and political infighting will surely result.

There is no natural tendency for big government to enjoy stability without excessive and brute force, as was used in the Soviet system. But eventually the natural tendency towards instability, as occurred in the Soviet Empire, will bring about NATO's well-deserved demise. NATO, especially since it has embarked on a new and dangerous imperialistic mission, will find using brute force to impose its will on others is doomed to fail.

It has been said that, in numbers, there is strength. But in politics, it can also be said that, in numbers, there is confusion as differences become magnified.

Nationalism is alive and well even within the 19-member NATO group. When nationalism is non-militaristic, peace loving, and freedom oriented, it is a force that will always undermine big government planners, whether found in a Soviet system or a NATO/U.N. system.

□ 1745

The smaller the unit of government, the better it is for the welfare of all

those who seek only peace and freedom. NATO no longer can hide its true intent behind an anti-communist commitment.

Some have wondered how a 1960s generation administration could be so prone to war. The 1960s were known for their rebellion against the Vietnam War and a preference for lovemaking and drugs over fighting, even Communists. In recent months four separate sovereign nations were bombed by the United States. This has to be some kind of a record. Bombing Belgrade on Easter has to tell us something about an administration that is still strangely seen by some as not having the determination to fight a real war. There is a big difference between being anti-war when one's life is at risk as compared to when it is someone else's. That may tell us something about character, but there is more to it than that.

Many who were opposed to the Persian Gulf and Vietnam Wars are now strongly supporting this so-called just and humanitarian war to punish those who are said to be totally responsible for the Yugoslavian refugee problem. The fact that Serbia is not Communist in the sense of North Vietnam may play a part for some in making the decision to support this war but not the war in Vietnam. But the Persian Gulf War was not at all about communism, it was about oil.

Some from the left, if strongly inclined toward internationalism, supported the Persian Gulf War, but for the most part the opposition came from those who chose not to support a president of the opposite party, while today, supporting one's own party's position to bomb the Serbs becomes politically correct.

The same can be said of those who are opposed to the Yugoslavian war. Where they supported the Persian Gulf War, this administration has not garnered their support for partisan reasons. The principle of interventionism, constitutionality and morality have not been applied consistently to each war effort by either political party, and there is a precise reason for this, over and above the petty partisanship of many.

The use of government force to mold personal behavior, manipulate the economy and interfere in the affairs of other nations is an acceptable practice endorsed by nearly everyone in Washington regardless of party affiliation. Once the principle of government force is acknowledged as legitimate, varying the when and to what degree becomes the only issue. It is okay to fight Communists overseas but not Serbs; it is okay to fight Serbs but not Arabs. The use of force becomes completely arbitrary and guided by the politician's good judgment. And when it pleases one group to use constitutional restraint, it does, but forgets about the restraints when it is not convenient.

The 1960s crowd, although having a reputation for being anti-war due to

their position on Vietnam, has never been bashful about its bold authoritarian use of force to mold economic conditions, welfare, housing, medical care, job discrimination, environment, wages and working conditions, combined with a love for taxes and inflation to pay the bills. When in general the principle of government force to mold society is endorsed, using force to punish Serbs is no great leap of faith, and for the interventionists is entirely consistent. Likewise, the interventionists who justified unconstitutional fighting in Vietnam, Panama, Nicaragua, Grenada, Libya and the Persian Gulf, even if they despise the current war in Yugoslavia, can easily justify using government force when it pleases them and their home constituency.

Philosophic interventionism is a politician's dream. It allows arbitrary intervention, domestic or international, and when political circumstances demand opposition, it is easy to cite the Constitution which always and correctly rejects the use of government force, except for national self-defense and for the protection of life, liberty and property.

Politicians love interventionism and pragmatism, the prevailing philosophy of our age, a philosophy based on relative ethics. No rigid adherence to law or morality is required. Even the Constitution can be used in this delicate debate of just when and for whom we go to war. The trick is to grab the political moral high ground while rejecting the entire moral foundation upon which the law rests, natural rights, rejection of force and the requirement politicians be strictly bound by a contract for which all of us take an oath to uphold.

What does this hodgepodge philosophy here in the Congress mean for the future of peace and prosperity in general and NATO and the United Nations in particular? Pragmatism cannot prevail. Economically and socially it breeds instability, bankruptcy, economic turmoil and factionalism here at home. Internationally it will lead to the same results.

NATO's days are surely numbered. That is the message of the current chaos in Yugoslavia. NATO may hold together in name only for a while, but its effectiveness is gone forever. The U.S. has the right to legally leave NATO with a 1-year's notice. That we ought to do, but we will not. We will continue to allow ourselves to bleed financially and literally for many years to come before it is recognized that governance of diverse people is best done by diverse and small governments, not by a one-world government dependent on the arbitrary use of force determined by politically correct reasons and manipulated by the powerful financial interests around the world.

Our more immediate problem is the financing of the ongoing war in Yugoslavia. On February 9 of this year I introduced legislation to deny funds to the President to wage war in Yugoslavia. The Congress chose to ignore

this suggestion and missed an opportunity to prevent the fiasco now ongoing in Yugoslavia.

The President, as so many other presidents have done since World War II, took it upon himself to wage an illegal war against Yugoslavia under NATO's authority, and Congress again chose to do nothing. By ignoring our constitutional responsibility with regards to war power, the Congress implicitly endorsed the President's participation in NATO's illegal war against Yugoslavia. We neither declared war nor told the President to cease and desist.

Now we have a third chance, and maybe our last, before the war gets out of control. We are being asked to provide all necessary funding for the war. Once we provide funds for the war, the Congress becomes an explicit partner in this ill-conceived NATO-inspired intervention in the civil war of a sovereign nation, making Congress morally and legally culpable.

Appropriating funds to pursue this war is not the way to peace. We have been bombing, boycotting and killing thousands in Iraq for 9 years with no end in sight. We have been in Bosnia for 3 years, with no end in sight. And once Congress endorses the war in Yugoslavia with funding, it could take a decade, billions of dollars, and much suffering on both sides, before we put it to an end.

Bellicosity and jingoism associated with careless and illegal intervention can never replace a policy of peace and friendship whenever possible. And when it is not, at least neutrality. NATO's aggressive war of destruction and vengeance can only make the situation worse. The sooner we disengage ourselves from this ugly civil war, the better. It is the right thing to do.

COMMEMORATION OF THE REMEMBRANCE OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know I am the last Speaker before the staff goes home, and they will be gratified to know that I will use roughly half the allotted time. Even with half the allotted time, 30 minutes is quite long, perhaps too long to devote to a single subject, and that is why I wish to give, in effect, three separate speeches.

The first speech I would like to give is in commemoration of the remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. April 24 is the day when Armenians and those of good conscience around the world remember the genocide that took place at the beginning of this century. Because it was on April 24 that 200 Armenian religious, political, intellectual leaders were rounded up in Constantinople, taken into the interior and executed.

This was a seminal day in a pattern of oppression that began in the 1890s, and at a level of oppression which between 1915 and 1923 caused the death of 1.5 million Armenians in mass executions in forced marches, through disease, and through starvation, thus eliminating virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and Western Armenia.

There were many contemporaries who were there to see this first genocide. Perhaps no one speaks with the authority of our own ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Ambassador Henry Morgenthau. I will probably mispronounce our ambassador's name, so I will simply refer to him as our ambassador to the Ottoman Empire. He recounts in his statement, "When the Turkish authorities gave orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race. They understood this well, and in their conversations with me made no particular attempt to conceal this fact."

In the poignant passage in his book, *Black Dog of Faith*, Peter Balakian relates the story of a genocide survivor. After seeing the massacre of Armenians in her own village, her father beheaded and crucified on the door of their home on one morning, the Armenian woman was forced to dance in the village square while being brutalized and set on fire, as their children clapped, and other images too horrific to describe. The death march and the Euphrates so filled with blood and corpses that no reasonable person could see it and not be sick.

The first genocide of this century laid the foundation for the Holocaust, the largest genocide and the most horrific of this or any century. It was interesting that our ambassador to the Ottoman Empire happened to be an American Jew who was told by Turkish authorities, "These people, these Armenians, are Christians. Since you are a Jew, why don't you let us do with the Christians as we please?"

Well, whether it is in Anatolia or in Europe or anywhere in the world, we cannot countenance genocide simply by saying the victims are not of our religion or ethnic group. No wonder 30 years later Adolf Hitler uttered his infamous statement about the Armenian Genocide.

Eight days before the invasion of Poland, which would place 3 million Jews under his control and which allowed Hitler to send them to their deaths, he told those in his inner circle who thought that the world might question this policy, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?" Clearly, the impunity that the Turkish government felt that they had in annihilating the Armenians emboldened Hitler before the worst of the Holocaust.

□ 1800

And that is why those of us of Jewish faith, Armenians, and everyone of good conscience must say, "never again."

The last act of a genocide is genocide denial. Because those who have committed it wish to blot out even the memory of those who they have killed. And it is, in fact, unfortunate that the Turkish Government continues its genocide denial, a genocide denial that is not just passive, not just intransigent, but takes the form of trying to erase from the history books of others that which happened at the beginning of this century.

Today I was honored to meet with the new chancellor of UCLA, my alma mater. And I am proud of UCLA. I was a Bruin when Walton was on the basketball court. And I was proud to meet our new chancellor, who described what is happening at UCLA. But the proudest day for UCLA was when it rejected a gift of over a million dollars from the Turkish Government, rejected a gift of over a million dollars.

It is not in the nature of universities to reject gifts, but this gift came with strings attached. It was to fund a chair in Ottoman history with various strings and provisos that virtually ensured that the Turkish Government would control who sat in that chair. It would not have been a chair for legitimate inquiry into historical facts but rather a chair in genocide denial. And UCLA stood firm and rejected that gift and said that the academic integrity of my alma mater and the academic integrity of all American universities is not for sale.

It is time for the American State Department to show this same level of courage and determination. It is time for the State Department and the U.S. executive branch of Government not just to remember the day April 24 but to use the word that describes what that day remembers. The word is "genocide." And it is time for the State Department to recognize what happened.

Clearly, at a time when the State Department is trying to rally our support to prevent mass murders in the Balkans, they should be honest as to what happened in Anatolia some 80-plus years ago.

PLAN NEEDED TO PROVIDE DIRECTIONAL SIGNS AT U.S. CAPITOL COMPLEX

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address a completely different subject and one that is not nearly so grave.

I had a chance to meet with the Architect of the United States Capitol, the man who keeps the facilities here running, to talk to him about some of the ways we could make this institution work better as a physical plant.

Mr. Speaker, we get four to five million tourists every year. Now, that does not cause us to rival Disneyland, although there are those who assert that the U.S. Congress rivals Disneyland in other respects, but it is indeed a large number of people to accommodate. And yet, I will just illustrate the problem with a story that happened last year.

Some constituents of mine came and visited the gallery, right up there. And